

**From:** [PETERSON Jenn L](mailto:PETERSON.Jenn.L)  
**To:** [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](mailto:Burt.Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA); [Robert W. Gensemer](mailto:Robert.W.Gensemer)  
**Cc:** [Carrie A. Smith](mailto:Carrie.A.Smith); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](mailto:Eric.Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](mailto:Joe.Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA)  
**Subject:** RE: Inconsistencies noted - media-specific MEs for wildlife  
**Date:** 02/07/2008 08:11 PM

---

While it may be an option, I know there are a lot of uncertainties unless the media specific number is based on a site-specific model and tissue (which if we have that data we will use instead). I would be fine dropping it or keeping it in.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2008 5:36 PM  
To: Robert W. Gensemer  
Cc: Carrie A. Smith; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov;  
Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L  
Subject: Re: Inconsistencies noted - media-specific MEs for wildlife

Bob,

Measurement endpoint 2 for the wildlife species is a risk characterization option that may be needed if we run into the situation where we can't derive ingested dose TRVs (mg/kg/day) for a COPC, but can find a media based TRV (e.g. mg/kg in prey tissue) for a COPC. If we have ingested dose TRVs for all COPCs for a wildlife assessment endpoint, we never get to and don't need wildlife ME2. I put it in as an option for LWG for the situation where we don't have ingested dose TRVs. Wouldn't be upset if people think it causes more confusion than it solves and we remove it.

Best regards,

Burt Shephard  
Risk Evaluation Unit  
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
1200 6th Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359

Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

"If your experiment needs statistics to analyze the results, then you ought to have done a better experiment"  
- Ernest Rutherford

"Robert W.  
Gensemer"  
<rgensemer@param  
etrix.com>

02/07/2008 05:10  
PM

To  
Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
PETERSON Jenn L  
<PETERSON.Jenn@deg.state.or.us>

cc  
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
"Carrie A. Smith"  
<CSmith@parametrix.com>

Subject  
Inconsistencies noted -  
media-specific MEs for wildlife

Burt and others: Carrie and I noticed that if we keep ME #2 for many of the wildlife receptors that deal with media-specific risk evaluations and TRVs (as opposed to dietary, ME #1), then we have some inconsistencies to resolve. While this ME #2 is in the assessment endpoint section text and AE table, it is NOT included in either the exposure tables, OR the WOE framework. I don't recall ever seeing this ME in any LWG documents in the past (including agreed-upon AE/ME tables), but perhaps I may have missed it...

So, if the decision is to keep these in, we have more work to do to add this ME into the exposure tables and WOE. The latter will not be easy, at least from my perspective, because I have not yet seen (nor has PMX evaluated) any wildlife TRVs other than dietary, so far as I can recall. As a result, it would be very challenging to generate WOE rankings for the effects assessment side.

Please advise so we can figure out how to handle the various PF elements

to ensure consistency. Thanks, -Bob

Parametrix  
inspired people - inspired solutions - making a difference

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.  
Operations Manager  
phone: 541.791.1667, x-6510  
fax: 541.791.1699  
cell: 541.760.1511  
rgensemer@parametrix.com